Proposed Final Version of the 2004 303(d) List

Summary of Public Comments and Division Responses

(Note: in some instances, public comments have been summarized in order to group similar observations by multiple reviewers.)

I. GENERAL COMMENTS: Review Process

I-1. *The draft 303(d) was compiled in a manner inconsistent with federal regulations.*

Response: We believe that our draft 303(d) is compiled properly and is consistent with federal regulations. Additionally, the list will be reviewed by EPA to insure compliance with federal law and regulations.

I-2. *The draft 303(d) public review process was inappropriately short. The comment period should be extended.*

Response: The draft 303(d) List was made available for review on June 10. We held 14 public meetings in 14 different cities between June 28 and July 20. The almost two month comment period officially ended on August 3, 2002. It should be noted that public comments concerning Tennessee's proposed final 303(d) List could also be directed to EPA. We believe that the public review timeframe was reasonable.

I-3. *Notice to the public about the availability of the draft 303(d) was inadequate.*

Response: The draft 303(d) List was posted on the department's website on June 10, the same day that the public notices were mailed. It was posted on the department's "What's New" site the next morning.

Additionally, the department issued numerous press releases about the 303(d) List and the public meetings. Several newspaper articles were written in response to the press releases and the meetings were well-attended by the media. Appendix A contains a timeline of activities undertaken by the department to get the word out about the 303(d) review process. We feel that we have met both the letter and spirit of the public notice requirements.

I-4. *When a draft 303(d) becomes available, the division should have paper copies for the public.*

Response: We had paper copies available shortly after the document was posted on the Web. Additionally, we handed out paper copies at all of the public meetings. We thought it preferable to go ahead and post the document on the web where most people could see it, rather than to delay the beginning of the review period until we had paper copies.

I-5. *Citizens cannot conveniently attend afternoon public meetings.*

Response: Our approach to scheduling public meetings was to combine afternoon and evening meetings within a general area. In each section of the state, citizens could choose whether to attend an afternoon meeting or an evening one, depending on their own scheduling needs.

I-6. *The commenter requests an individual response to their concerns about the 303(d) List.*

Response: It would be impractical to provide an individual response to each commenter. Additionally, it would be unfair to the other reviewers of the list if they could not read and consider the department's responses to the questions raised by the other commenters.

I-7. *The division disregards data and comments submitted by citizens.*

Response: We reviewed all the data that were provided as part of the assessment process. However, not all information was considered sufficient to be used to assess streams, especially if sample collection and/or analysis questions could not be resolved.

We have carefully considered the comments we received during the review process and have provided a response for each. In cases where we do not agree with a comment, we have explained our basis. However, it should be noted that a significant number of comments that we received at the public meetings were off the topic of the 303(d) List. While we are interested in all comments, our response document is limited to those dealing with the 303(d) List.

II. GENERAL COMMENTS: Use of Criteria and Designated Uses

II-1 *As there is no organic enrichment criterion in Tennessee, it should not be used as a cause of impairment.*

Response: Tennessee uses a standardized set of causes of impairment suggested by EPA. "Organic enrichment" is one of these EPA suggested causes.

The commenter is correct that there is no water quality criterion specific to organic enrichment. Organic enrichment is a condition in which elevated levels of nutrients or other organic substances are introduced into a stream or lake. This introduction has an effect that can include stimulation of biomass or removal of water column oxygen levels. When these conditions cause undesirable ecological changes such as increased plant growth or a loss of biological integrity, the public's beneficial uses of the stream or lake can be lost or impaired.

The conditions caused by organic enrichment are specifically covered by criteria. Examples of these conditions include elevated nutrients, loss of biological integrity, and alteration of in-stream habitat. Violation of these criteria creates the condition of pollution and such a stream should be 303(d) listed.

II-2 *The commenter understands that Tennessee has established regional nutrient goals. Are these goals available for review?*

Response: During the summer of 2003, the Water Quality Control Board promulgated an emergency rule that established a narrative nutrient criterion for Tennessee's waterbodies. For wadeable streams, the regulation specifically cited the regional nutrient goals identified in a 2001 division document entitled *Development of Regionally-based Interpretations of Tennessee's Narrative Nutrient Criterion* as a proper basis for applying the narrative criterion. EPA formally approved the emergency nutrient criterion as being consistent with their guidance.

The text of the emergency rule was then incorporated into the General Water Quality Criteria [(1200-4-3-.03(i)] during the triennial review that was completed in January 2004.

The 2001 nutrient study report is posted on the department's web page. It can be accessed at www.state.tn.us/environment/wpc/publications/

III. GENERAL COMMENTS: Assessment Methodologies

III-1. *Unless the division forwards all data used in individual assessments, the reviewer cannot adequately review these listings. Such data should be provided.*

Response: We are willing to discuss individual assessments. Some of the information utilized in the assessment process is readily accessible in public databases such as STORET. All of it is part of the formal record for this process.

However, we cannot package and individually provide to each reviewer all data used in the assessment process, for the streams of particular interest to that reviewer. Our files can be reviewed during normal working hours for those wishing to undertake an in-depth investigation.

III-2. *It is difficult to locate the impaired segments based on the information provided in the 303(d) List.*

Response: The department has posted links from its website to a mapping service for its water quality assessment information. This database is on the University of Memphis server. By clicking on a stream segment on the map, citizens will be able to tell which segments are impacted in an area and can access general assessment information.

III-3. *The federal Clean Water Act requires that all "threatened" streams be listed on the 303(d) List, something that Tennessee has not done.*

Response: EPA specifically defines "threatened" as waterbodies where a documented trend can be used to project that water quality standards will be violated before the next assessment cycle. As a practical matter, we seldom have data that so clearly documents predictable patterns in water quality.

III-4. *The State must list all impaired or threatened waters.*

Response: We agree, provided that data are available to justify such an assessment.

III-5. *High quality streams should be listed on the 303(d) List, as they need a TMDL to prevent degradation.*

Response: These waters are subject to 303(d) if they meet the listing protocol. We consider the existing antidegradation requirements found in the water quality standards to provide a much more practical shield against degradation in high quality waters.

III-6. *The State must use all existing data and provide for public input to the 303(d) listing process.*

Response: We agree and actively solicited data from other sources. We note that the regulation further defines existing data as being "readily available." Additionally, data must be scientifically defensible.

III-7. *The division should use non-monitored data such as dilution calculations and predictive modeling to list waters as impaired.*

Response: We agree that dilution calculations and predictive modeling have an important place in assessment efforts and we have a long history of practical use of these tools to help Tennessee meet its clean water goals. However, 303(d) listings must be defensible and the best basis is provided by the collection of data from individual streams.

IV. GENERAL COMMENTS: Permitting

IV-1. *The division allows the use of general permits in 303(d) listed streams. This is inconsistent with provisions of federal regulations that require that additional loadings not be added to impaired streams.*

Response: Only general permit coverages that do not authorize additional loadings to impaired waters may be allowed.

IV-2. *The division issues permits in 303(d) listed streams, even if the required TMDLs have not been completed.*

Response: Tennessee is diligently working through all the TMDLs needed for impaired waters. In lower priority streams, it may be some time before the TMDL is completed. In the meantime, the responsibility of the division is to not authorize additional loadings of pollutants of concern to streams identified as impaired. The division adheres to an EPA-approved strategy for permitting into impaired waters.

IV-3. *The division uses the 303(d) List to set permit limits. Since listings cannot be appealed, the regulated community should be given adequate time for review.*

Response: We agree that the regulated community should review the draft 303(d) List. As established in previous responses, it is our position that the nearly two-month period provided for review of the draft is adequate for that purpose.

It is the impaired status of the stream, rather than the 303(d) listing, that provides the basis for permit conditions.

IV-4. *The 303(d) List should be promulgated as a regulation by the Tennessee Water Quality Control Board.*

Response: The issue raised by the commenter is a matter of current litigation. The state's strongly held position is that the 303(d) List is a public information report and not appropriate for promulgation as a regulation.

IV-5 *When comparisons are made between the 2002 303(d) List and the 2004 version, it becomes clear that TDEC's regulations are inadequate to control agricultural sources of pollution.*

Response: Some agricultural activities can be regulated under the TDEC's authority under the Tennessee Water Quality Control Act. Regulated activities include stream alterations, wetlands conversion, and concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFO), and point source discharges. When agricultural and forestry activities that are not regulated directly by TDEC cause an impairment to streams, we work with partner agencies to provide resources and technical assistance to land owners so they can improve management practices.

V. SPECIFIC COMMENTS

V-1. *The mileage for the impaired section of Elk Fork Creek (TN05130101091-100) is too small. More than 3.9 miles of this stream is impacted, especially in the headwaters. Additionally, a tributary, Little Elk Fork (TN05130101091-1000), should also be assessed.*

Response: We believe that the Elk Fork Creek and its tributaries are correctly assessed. TDEC has multiple sampling stations in this watershed.

Terry Creek – TDEC staff performed a biological survey (biorecon) at mile 0.4 (u/s Highway 297) in 2000. Habitat and biological index scores were high. The stream is considered fully supporting.

Lick Fork – TDEC staff performed intensive biological surveys (RBPIII) at two locations in 2003. At mile 0.9 (u/s Tulip Lane), habitat and biological index scores were in the acceptable range. At mile 3.8 (Elk Valley Road), habitat and biological index scores were also in the acceptable range. Additionally, TDEC staff performed a biological survey (biorecon) at mile 0.3 (u/s Highway 297) in 2000. Habitat and biological index scores were good. The stream is considered fully supporting.

Little Elk Creek – TDEC staff performed an intensive biological survey (RBPIII) in 2003 at mile 6.2 (Elk Valley). Habitat and biological index scores were in the acceptable range. Additionally, TDEC staff performed a biological survey (biorecon) at mile 0.1 (Highway 297) in 2000. Habitat and biological index scores were good. The stream is considered fully supporting.

Upper Elk Fork – TDEC staff performed a biological survey (biorecon) at mile 7.0 (Highway 297) in 2000. Habitat and biological index scores were good. The upper section of Elk Fork Creek is considered fully supporting.

Lower Elk Fork – TDEC staff performed a biological survey (biorecon) at mile 2.0 (near Indian Mountain State Park) in 2000. Habitat and biological index scores were below acceptable levels. The lower section of Elk Fork Creek (3.9 miles) is considered impacted.

V-2. *The source of pollutants in Straight Fork Creek (TN05130104044-0500) is given as "resource extraction." This should be "abandoned mining" instead, as there are no active mining sites in this watershed. What is the source of the habitat alteration in this stream?*

Response: We reviewed this assessment and agree with the commenter. We will change the source to "abandoned mining" for this segment. As additional clarification, the habitat alteration referenced on this segment was the channelization of a section of the stream for the Highway 63 construction project.

V-3. *Pigeon Roost Creek should not be listed for pathogens as recent data indicate that the water quality standard is being met.*

Response: In the most recent sampling performed by the division, field staff collected monthly water quality samples from two locations on Pigeon Roost Creek during 2003. The results of this monitoring indicate that the pathogen water quality criterion is not being met.

V-4. *Pigeon Roost Creek should not be listed for nutrients. The levels of nutrients in the creek are similar to those found in a nearby reference stream.*

Response: Pigeon Roost Creek is on the 303(d) List because it violates the biological integrity standard. Additionally, the composition of the biological community indicates excess nutrients and grab sample results confirm that nutrient levels exceed the division's regional numeric interpretation of the narrative nutrient criteria. That is appropriate grounds for listing the stream as impacted by nutrients.

V-5. *Pigeon Roost Creek algae levels are lower than those cited by EPA as likely to cause impairment to the benthic community.*

Response: We respectfully disagree with the commenter's position that the documented biological impairment in Pigeon Roost Creek is unrelated to nutrient levels. The biological community in the downstream section of Pigeon Roost Creek is dominated by species tolerant of elevated organic loadings. This finding has been established by TDEC stream studies and confirmed by surveys undertaken by others.

V-6. *TDEC developed a TMDL for siltation in the Stones River watershed. What load reduction will have to be achieved before the West Fork of the Stones River can be delisted.*

Response: The TMDL developed for siltation in the West Fork Stones River proposed load reductions for many of the small tributaries to the river. These suggested load reductions ranged from about ten to fifty percent. The TMDL for the Stones watershed, which has been approved by EPA, can be accessed at the department's web page at www.state.tn.us/environment/wpc/tmdl/

The West Fork Stones is listed primarily because it fails to meet the state's biological integrity criterion. Excess silt is considered to be a significant part of the reason that the biological community has been impacted. As a practical matter, the more likely basis for delisting the stream would be that it meets water quality standards, rather than a calculated load reduction goal has been achieved.

V-7. *To what extent does the Murfreesboro Sinking Creek WWTP contribute to the listing of the West Fork of the Stones River.*

Response: A TMDL will be needed for the West Fork Stones River to identify pollutant sources throughout the watershed and to propose a control strategy for each. Prior to the TMDL being developed, we are not in a position to quantify with any precision the relative pollutant contributions of any specific source.

V-8. *Can the activities undertaken by the Murfreesboro Water and Sewer Department to alleviate the loadings of pollutants from the WWTP, such as diversion and land application of treated wastewater, allow the river to be delisted.*

Response: We are confident that the steps taken by Murfreesboro to decrease the stress on the West Fork Stones River will result in improved water quality. When water quality standards are consistently being met in the river, we will be pleased to propose delisting.

V-9. *What are the background levels of nutrients in the West Fork Stones River?*

Response: We consider the data collected at our reference streams to suitably represent background levels in Tennessee's ecoregions. The regional nutrient water quality goals established by the division for wadeable streams are based on the 90^{th} percentile of all reference stream data. In the region that includes the West Fork Stones River, the nitrate+nitrite goal is 0.92 mg/L. For phosphorus, the goal is 0.18 mg/L.

More information about nutrient levels at reference streams can be obtained from the TDEC report *Development of Regionally-based Interpretations of Tennessee's Narrative Nutrient Criterion* , which is posted, on the department's web page at www.state.tn.us/environment/wpc/publications/

V-10. *In the 2002 303(d) list, Dog Creek (TN05130204001-0500) was listed as impaired. It is not on the 2004 List and does not appear in Appendix A as being delisted.*

Response: In the 2002 303(d) List, Dog Creek appears in Appendix C. It was considered impaired by habitat alteration, but was already covered by an EPA-approved TMDL for that condition.

The division reassessed Dog Creek for the 2004 assessment cycle. Based on recently collected data, the stream now appears to meet the biological integrity criterion. It should have been identified in Appendix A of the 2004 303(d) List as having improved. We will add this stream to Appendix A.

V-11. *In the 2002 303(d) list, Barren Fork (TN05130204006-0510) was listed as impaired. It is not on the 2004 List and does not appear in Appendix A as being delisted.*

Response: In the 2002 303(d) List, Barren Fork (now TN05130204006-0700) appears in Appendix C. It was considered impaired by siltation, but was already covered by an EPA-approved TMDL for that condition.

The division reassessed Barren Fork for the 2004 assessment cycle. Based on recently collected data, the stream now appears to meet the biological integrity criterion. It should have been identified in Appendix A of the 2004 303(d) List as having improved. We will add this stream to Appendix A.

V-12. *In the 2002 303(d) list, Bedford Creek (TN05130204010-0500) was listed as impaired. It is not on the 2004 List and does not appear in Appendix A as being delisted.*

Response: In the 2002 303(d) List, Bedford Creek appears in Appendix C. It was considered impaired by siltation and habitat alteration, but was already covered by an EPA-approved TMDL for that condition.

The division reassessed Bedford Creek for the 2004 assessment cycle. Based on recently collected data, the stream now appears to meet the biological integrity criterion. It should have been identified in Appendix A of the 2004 303(d) List as having improved. We will add this stream to Appendix A.

V-13. *In the 2002 303(d) list, Fivemile Creek (TN05130204016-0900) was listed as impaired. It is not on the 2004 List and does not appear in Appendix A as being delisted.*

Response: In the 2002 303(d) List, Fivemile Creek appears in Appendix C. It was considered impaired by siltation and habitat alteration, but was already covered by an EPA-approved TMDL for that condition.

The division reassessed Fivemile Creek for the 2004 assessment cycle. Based on recently collected data, the stream now appears to meet the biological integrity criterion. It should have been identified in Appendix A of the 2004 303(d) List as having improved. We will add this stream to Appendix A.

V-14. *The Harpeth River Watershed Association has data that indicate that Paige Branch, a tributary to Arrington Creek (TN05130204016-0500), is impaired. It should be listed on the 303(d) List even if Arrington Creek has improved.*

Response: Paige Branch is a very small tributary (three mile total length) to Arrington Creek. The listing of Arrington Creek in previous 303(d) cycles, and the proposed 2004 delisting, were based on data collected on the mainstem Arrington Creek. The division did not previously have data on Paige Branch.

We were not aware of the biological data collected by the Harpeth River Watershed Association until very recently. We agree with the commenter that these results call into question the appropriateness of including Paige Branch in with the Arrington Creek delisting. For this reason, we will separate Paige Branch from the Arrington Creek assessment and will give Paige Branch a distinct segment number.

We will reassess Paige Branch during the next assessment cycle. In the meantime, we will place Paige Branch in Category 3 (not assessed).

V-15. *TVA has attempted to mitigate dissolved oxygen and flow issues below South Holston Reservoir (TN06010102014-1000). Please make a note of this in the comments field.*

Response: We will add this comment.

V-16. *TVA has attempted to mitigate dissolved oxygen issues below Cherokee Reservoir (TN06010104001-2000). Additionally, the recent Record of Decision for the River Operations Study requires that tailwater temperatures be protective of listed species. Please make a note of this in the comments field.*

Response: We will add this comment.

V-17. *TVA has attempted to mitigate dissolved oxygen issues below Douglas Reservoir. This should be included in the comments.*

Response: We will add this comment.

V-18. *The West Prong Little Pigeon River is listed as impaired, however, the Pigeon Forge WWTP is not listed as a source. Can facilities increase their loadings if they are not named as a source of pollutants in a listed stream?*

Response: Additional loadings of a substance(s) already identified as violating water quality standards in an impaired stream cannot be authorized, regardless whether or not the facility is identified as a source on the 303(d) List.

However, it is important to note that the commenter has asked about a stream primarily impacted by pathogens. Point source dischargers are able to effectively disinfect the wastewater they discharge. Thus, the impairment of the receiving stream due to pathogens would not necessarily preclude the expansion of a point source discharger, provided that they could effectively disinfect their effluent.

V-19. *Four sources of pollution are identified on the West Prong of the Little Pigeon River. What is the relative contribution of each?*

Response: As stated in a previous response, prior to a TMDL being developed, we are not in a position to quantify with any precision the relative pollutant contributions of any specific source.

V-20. *TVA has injected oxygen into the forebay of Fort Loudoun Reservoir to improve dissolved oxygen levels. This should be included in the comments.*

Response: We will add the requested information in the comments.

V-21. *TVA has attempted to mitigate dissolved oxygen and flow alteration issues below Norris Reservoir (TN06010207019-2000). Please note this in the comments field.*

Response: We will add this comment, but note that the Clinch River downstream of Norris Reservoir is not currently listed for low dissolved oxygen.

V-22. *Clear Creek is listed as being impacted for 8.8 miles due to the oil spill. This seems to be larger that the actual area of impacts.*

Response: The commenter is correct. In the draft, we miscalculated the mileage of the impacted section, which goes from Elmer Howard Road to the mouth of Whites Creek. This will be corrected in the proposed final version, which will indicate that 1.41 miles of Clear Creek are impacted.

V-23. *TVA has plans to increase the flows from Apalachia Dam into the "bypass" section of the Hiwassee River. Please note this in the comments.*

Response: We will add this comment.

V-24. *TVA has existing agreements with the state of Tennessee and/or outfitters to provide recreational releases downstream of Ocoee # 2 and Ocoee # 3. Please note this in the comments.*

Response: We will add this comment.

V-25. *The division listed an unnamed tributary to South Chickamauga Creek (TN06020001007-0200) as impacted by habitat alteration. However, the impacts to the stream were authorized under a permit issued by TDEC. Additionally, the division accepted off-site mitigation as compensation for the damage done to the unnamed tributary. This stream should not have been listed.*

Response: The commenter is correct that the stream was 303(d) listed in 2002 after the completion of habitat alterations authorized by the division under an Aquatic Resource Alteration Permit. The Water Quality Control Act prohibits permitted activities that result in a violation of water quality standards. When unavoidable impacts to water of the state are authorized, the applicant must mitigate for any appreciable loss of resource value.

The mitigation project offered by the applicant was approved as acceptable mitigation for the unavoidable loss of uses in the impacted stream. Because no overall net loss of resource value resulted from the permitted activity, the unnamed tributary to South Chickamauga Creek should not have been listed as impacted by habitat alteration. The Division will propose delisting the stream for habitat alterations in the proposed final version of the 2004 303(d) List by moving the listing to Appendix A. EPA will have to approve the basis for this proposed delisting.

However, it should be noted that in addition to habitat alteration, the stream is also listed for organic enrichment/low DO and pathogens. The stream will need to remain listed for these causes.

V-26. *The division listed Standifer Creek (TN06020004001-0110) in Marion County as being impacted by silt from land development and pasture grazing. There is no longer much grazing in this watershed, so pasture grazing should be deleted as a source.*

Response: We reviewed this listing and agree with the commenter. We will make this revision.

V-27. *TVA has attempted to mitigate dissolved oxygen issues below Tims Ford Reservoir (TN06030003015-1000). Please note this in the comments field.*

Response: We will add this comment, but note that the Elk River downstream of Tims Ford Reservoir is not currently listed for low dissolved oxygen.

V-28. *In the 2002 303(d) list, the North Fork of the South Fork Forked Deer River (TN08010205028-1000) was listed as impaired. It is not on the 2004 List and does not appear in Appendix A as being delisted.*

Response: In the 2002 303(d) List, the North Fork of the South Fork Forked Deer River appears in Appendix C. It was considered impaired by pathogens, but was already covered by an EPA-approved TMDL for that condition.

The division reassessed the North Fork of the South Fork Forked Deer River for the 2004 assessment cycle. Based on recently collected data, the stream now appears to meet the pathogen criterion. It should have been identified in Appendix A of the 2004 303(d) List as having improved. We will add this stream to Appendix A.

V-29. *In the 2002 303(d) list, an Unnamed Trib to Fletcher Creek (TN08010210023-0200) was listed as impaired. It is not on the 2004 List and does not appear in Appendix A as being delisted.*

Response: In the 2002 303(d) List, the Unnamed Trib to Fletcher Creek appears in Appendix C. It was considered impaired by pathogens, but was already covered by an EPA-approved TMDL for that condition.

We have no additional data at this time that would justify a delisting of the stream and it appears to have been inadvertently left off the 2004 List. We will add this stream back to the 2004 proposed final version of the document.

APPENDIX A
2004 303(d) Outreach Activities

June 8 – Draft 303(d) posted on website.

June 8 – Notice mailed to addresses on Division of Water Pollution Control's public notice list.

June 11 - statewide press release sent out.

June 21- news release issued to Jackson and Dyersburg media outlets (Jackson Sun, WBBJ-TV, WDXI-AM, WZDX-FM, WTJS-AM, WMXX-FM, State Gazette, Union City Messenger and Lake Co. Banner).

June 21- News release issued to Memphis area media (Memphis CA, WHBQ-TV, WMC-TV, WPTY-TV, WREC-TV, KJMS-FM, WGKX-FM, WREC-AM, WMC-AM/FM, WLOK-AM, WKNP-FM, WKNO-FM, Memphis Flyer, Memphis Business Journal).

June 24 - News release issued to Williamson County media (Franklin Review Appeal, Williamson AM, Brentwood Journal, Associated Press).

June 28 - News release issued to Nashville and Murfreesboro area media (Tennessean, 4 television stations, WPLN-FM, WLAC-AM, TRN, Nashvillle Business Journal, Daily News Journal, Rutherford AM).

June 28 - Afternoon public meeting held in Jackson. Local radio and television outlet cover meeting.

June 28 - Evening public meeting held in Dyersburg. Local newspaper reporter attends and writes article about discussions.

June 29 - Afternoon public meeting held in Memphis. Local newspaper reporter attends.

June 29 - Evening public meeting held in Memphis (Bartlett).

July 1 - News release issued to Cookeville media (Herald Citizen, Sparta Expositor, Southern Standard, WHUB-Am, WPTN-AM).

July 1 - Evening public meeting held in Franklin.

July 6 - Afternoon meeting in downtown Nashville.

July 6 - News release went out to Tri-cities press for Elizabethton/Kingsport meetings. (Elizabethton Star, Greeneville Sun, Business Journal of the Tri-Cities, Kingport Times-News, WCYB, WEMT, WKPT/WKPK, The Erwin Record, Johnson City Press, Jonesborough Herald and Tribune, Kingsport Daily News).

July 6 - News release went out to Chattanooga area press for Cleveland/ Chattanooga meetings. (Chattanooga Times, Cleveland Daily Banner, Daily Post Athenian, Dayton Herald-News, WDEF, WRCB, WTVC, The Chattanoogan, Bradley News Weekly).

July 6 - News release went out to Knox area press for Wartburg/Knoxville meetings (Knoxville News Sentinel, WATE, WBIR, WTNZ, WVLT, Morristown Citizen Tribune, Clinton Courier News, Maryville Daily Times, Sevierville Mountain Press, Oak Ridger, Roane County News, MetroPulse, LaFollette Press, Newport Plain Talk).

July 6 - Evening public meeting held in Murfreesboro.

July 8 - Evening public meeting held in Cookeville. Local newspaper reporter attends and writes article about discussions.

July 12- Additional news release sent to Chattanooga area press.

July 12 - Evening public meeting held in Elizabethton. Local newspaper reporter attends and writes article about discussions. TV station also attends and does story.

July 13 - Afternoon public meeting held in Kingsport. Local newspaper reporter attends and writes article about discussions.

July 15 - Another news release sent to Knoxville area press.

July 15 - Evening public meeting held in Cleveland. Local newspaper reporter attends and writes article about discussions.

July 16 - Afternoon public meeting held in Chattanooga.

July 19 - Evening public meeting held in Wartburg. Two local newspaper reporters attend and write article about discussions.

July 20 - Afternoon public meeting held in Knoxville. Local newspaper reporter attends and writes article about discussions. TV station attends and interviews participants.

August 3 - Public participation period ended.